PERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ORANGE CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER

DEC 1 6, 2011

ALAN CARLSON, Clerk of the Court

Sy S. GARCIA

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER

NOV 02 2011

BY:____S. NEW

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF ORANGE

10

1.1

12

13

14

1Š

16

17

18

9

1

2

:3

5

:6

:7

:8

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, EX-REL. CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER **OUALITY CONTROL BOARD, SANTA ANA** REGION

Plaintiff.

V.

KIRKHILL-TA CO., AND DOES 1 THROUGH 25, INCLUSIVE,

Defendants

Case No. 30-2011-00463149-CU-TT-CJC

STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT AND FINAL ORDER [PROPOSED]

The Hon. Francisco F. Firmat

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

STIPULATED CONSENT JUDGMENT AND FINAL ORDER [PROPOSED] 27329-7457/LEGAL21955307.3

. 9

13.

This Stipulated Consent Judgment and Final Order (Consent Judgment) is entered into by Plaintiff THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel., CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD, SANTA ANA REGION (Regional Board) and Defendant KIRKHILL-TA Co. (Kirkhill or Defendant). For purposes of this Consent Judgment, the Regional Board and Kirkhill shall be referred to collectively as the "Parties." The Parties have agreed to settle the above-captioned matter without further litigation, as set forth below.

INTRODUCTION

On March 30, 2011, the Regional Board filed a complaint in this matter in Orange County Superior Court naming as Defendant Kirkhill and related parties, and alleging various violations of the California Water Code with respect to actions undertaken at Kirkhill's facility in the City of Brea, California. Following the filing of the Complaint, the Parties commenced discussions aimed at resolving the claims alleged by the Regional Board. The violations alleged in the Complaint include the discharge of pollutants, including unauthorized non-storm water, to Fullerton Creek and Craig Lake, both waters of the United States, in violation of its California waste discharge requirements (WDR) and Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act) storm water permit. This Consent Judgment does not constitute evidence of, or an admission by, any party regarding any issue of fact or law alleged in the Complaint, and Defendant denies the claims as asserted in the Complaint. To avoid litigation over the claims asserted in the Complaint, the Parties enter into this Consent Judgment pursuant to a compromise and settlement of disputed claims.

CONSENT JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO STIPULATION; ORDER

The Parties, after opportunity for review by counsel, hereby stipulate and consent to the entry of this Consent Judgment as set forth below.

1. DEFINITIONS

Except where otherwise expressly defined in this Consent Judgment, all terms shall be interpreted consistent with Chapter 5.5 of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, Water Code sections 13370 et seq. and the regulations promulgated under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 40 C.F.R. 100 et seq.

2. JURISDICTION

The Parties agree that the Superior Court of California, County of Orange, has subject matter jurisdiction over the matters alleged in this action and personal jurisdiction over the Parties to this Consent Judgment.

3. PAYMENTS FOR PENALTIES, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ENFORCEMENT AND OTHER PROJECTS

3.1. Total Penalties

Kirkhill shall be liable for a total of one million seven hundred thirty eight thousand three hundred thirty eight dollars and thirty one cents (\$1,738,338.31) in civil penalties, costs, and attorneys' fees, allocated as set forth in Sections 3.2 below. On entry of this Consent Judgment, Kirkhill shall deliver all required payments to the Regional Board to:

Gary Tavetian
Deputy Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, California, 90013

for distribution pursuant to the terms of this Consent Judgment.

3.2. Penalty Payment

Within sixty (60) days of entry of the Consent Judgment, Kirkhill shall pay one million seven hundred thirty eight thousand three hundred thirty eight dollars and thirty one cents (\$1,738,338.31), delivered as set forth in section 3.1 above and the Funds are to be distributed as follows:

i. One million six hundred sixteen thousand four hundred and ten dollars (\$1,616,410.00), of which one million five hundred eighty-nine thousand dollars (\$1,589,000.00) is for penalties and of which twenty-seven thousand four hundred ten dollars (\$27,410.00) is for the Regional Board's investigation costs. Payment of One million six hundred sixteen thousand four hundred and ten dollars (\$1,616,410.00) shall be made to the State Water Pollution Cleanup and Abatement Account as penalties and costs. The Regional Board strongly supports, and will encourage the State Water Board to appropriate, upon application of the County of Orange and/or

City of Brea, some of the penalties (not to exceed \$794,500.00) to fully or partially fund projects to restore Craig Lake, Fullerton Creek and the watershed that feeds into Craig Lake. The projects would be unrelated to the allegations against Kirkhill made in the complaint.

- ii. Fifty two thousand four hundred forty five dollars and twenty cents
 (\$52,445.20) in attorneys' fees incurred by the Regional Board payable to the Office of Attorney
 General of the State of California.
- iii. Twenty eight thousand two hundred eighty five dollars and eighty eight cents (\$28,285.88) in costs payable to the City of Brea.
- iv. Forty one thousand one hundred ninety seven dollars and twenty three cents (\$41,197.23) in costs payable to the County of Orange.

3.3. Penalties For Late Payments

Kirkhill shall be liable for a Stipulated Civil Penalty of one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each day that a payment required pursuant to Sections 3.1 through 3.2 is late, subject to the Consent Judgment enforcement provisions set forth in Sections 5.1 and 5.2, below.

4. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

4.1. Water Code Violations

Pursuant to this Consent Judgment, Kirkhill shall not discharge from its facility unauthorized non-storm water either directly or indirectly to waters of the United States as stated in Condition A.1 of its industrial stormwater permit, which is attached hereto as Exhibit A, except as provided in Condition D.1 of that permit. If that industrial stormwater permit is either amended or superseded, then Kirkhill is obligated to comply with the amended terms or the superseded permit.

5. ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTIES

5.1. Procedure

The Regional Board may move this Court to enforce any provision of this Consent

Judgment and to award other appropriate relief, including penalties as provided in Sections 5.2.,

by serving and filing a regularly noticed motion in accordance with Code of Civil Procedure

section 1005 (Enforcement Motion). Kirkhill may file an opposition, and the Regional Board

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

5.2. Remedies and Sanctions

The Court has the authority to penalize any violation of this Consent Judgment. Any penalty paid pursuant to this section shall be delivered as set forth in Sections 3.1 above, with a check made payable to the State Water Pollution Cleanup and Abatement Account.

5.2.a. Contempt

The Court retains, in addition to the above described enforcement procedures, its power to enforce the Consent Judgment through contempt.

MATTERS COVERED BY THIS CONSENT JUDGMENT 6.

6.1. This Consent Judgment is a complete, final and binding resolution and settlement of all claims, violations or causes of action alleged by the Regional Board in the Complaint against Kirkhill and/or its respective directors, officers, governing boards, parent companies, subsidiaries, employees, heirs, assigns, successors, agents and contractors acting under their direction (collectively, the Covered Parties) based on the facts alleged in the Complaint, including all costs of investigation and attorneys' fees incurred by the Regional Board or their counsel (Covered Matters). Therefore, the Regional Board covenants not to file any other complaint(s), whether judicial or administrative (including, without limitation, under the Administrative Civil Liability or other enforcement provisions of the California Water Code), against the Covered Parties arising from or related to the Covered Matters. The Regional Board reserves the right, however, to pursue any claim that is not a Covered Matter.

27

7. NOTICE

All submissions and notices required by this Consent Judgment shall be sent to: For the Regional Board:

4

.5

б

7

8

1

2

3

Gary E. Tavetian, Esq. Noah Golden-Krasner, Esq. Deputy Attorneys General Office of the Attorney General 300 S. Spring Street, 11th Floor Los Angeles, California 90013 Phone: (213) 897-2639

Fax: (213) 897-2802

E-mail: Gary. Tavetian@doj.ca.gov

9

(with a copy to)

10

11

Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board 3737 Main Street, Suite 500 Riverside, CA 92501-3348 Attention: Stephen Mayville

13

14

15

12

For Kirkhill:
Donald J. Kula
Perkins Coie LLP
888 Century Park East, Suite 1700
Los Angeles, CA 90067-1721
Phone: 310.788.9900
Fax: 310.843.1291

16 17

E-mail: dkula@perkinscoie.com

18

(with a copy to)

19

Kirkhill-TA, Co. 300 East Cypress Street Brea, CA 92821

Mr. Rick Gentle

20

Tel: (714) 529-4901 Fax: (714) 529-6716

21

22

23

24

2526

27

Any Party may change its notice name and address by informing the other Parties in writing, but no change is effective until it is received. All notices and other communications required or permitted under this Consent Judgment that are properly addressed as provided in this Section are effective upon delivery if delivered personally or by overnight mail, or are effective five (5) days following deposit in the United States mail, postage prepaid, if delivered by mail.

28

8. NECESSITY FOR WRITTEN APPROVALS

All approvals and decisions of the Regional Board under the terms of this Consent

Judgment shall be communicated to Kirkhill in writing. No oral advice, guidance, suggestions or
comments by employees or officials of the Regional Board regarding submissions or notices
required or given under this Consent Judgment shall be construed to relieve Kirkhill of its
obligation, if any, to obtain any final written approval required by this Consent Judgment.

9. EFFECT OF JUDGMENT

Except as expressly provided in this Consent Judgment, nothing in this Consent Judgment is intended nor shall it be construed to preclude the Regional Board, or any state, county, or local agency, department, board or entity, or any CUPA, from exercising its authority under any law, statute or regulation.

10. NO WAIVER OF RIGHT TO ENFORCE

The failure of the Regional Board to enforce any provision of this Consent Judgment shall neither be deemed a waiver of such provision nor in any way affect the validity of this Consent Judgment, except as set forth in this Consent Judgment or by operation of any applicable statute of limitations. The failure of the Regional Board to enforce any such provision shall not preclude it from later enforcing the same or any other provision of this Consent Judgment, unless otherwise provided in the Consent Judgment. The "no waiver" provisions in this paragraph do not apply to, or interfere with, the operation of any applicable statute of limitations. No oral advice, guidance, suggestions or comments by employees or officials of any Party regarding matters covered in this Consent Judgment shall be construed to relieve any Party of its obligations under this Consent Judgment.

11. REGULATORY CHANGES

Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall excuse Kirkhill from meeting any more stringent requirements that may be imposed by changes in the applicable law.

12. APPLICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

This Consent Judgment shall apply to and be binding upon the Regional Board and Kirkhill and their respective employees, agents, successors and assigns.

13. AUTHORITY TO ENTER CONSENT JUDGMENT

Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized by the Party he or she represents to enter into this Consent Judgment, to execute it on behalf of the Party represented and legally to bind that Party.

14. CONTINUING JURISDICTION

The Parties agree that this Court has exclusive jurisdiction to interpret and enforce the Consent Judgment. The Court shall retain continuing jurisdiction to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment and to address any other matters arising out of or regarding this Consent Judgment. The Parties shall meet and confer prior to the filing of any motion relating to this Consent Judgment, including any Enforcement Motion as required by Section 5.1, and shall negotiate in good faith in an effort to resolve any dispute without judicial intervention.

15. INTERPRETATION

The Parties agree that the rule of construction holding that ambiguity is construed against the drafting Party shall not apply to the interpretation of this Consent Judgment.

16. COUNTERPART SIGNATURES

This Consent Judgment may be executed by the Parties in counterpart.

17. INTEGRATION

This Consent Judgment constitutes the entire agreement between the Parties and may not be amended or supplemented except as provided for in the Consent Judgment.

18. MODIFICATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

This Consent Judgment may be modified only by the Court, or upon mutual written consent by the Parties and the approval of the Court.

19. TERMINATION OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

Except as otherwise set forth in Section 3.9 herein, this Consent Judgment will expire and be of no further effect after October, 2021 (the Termination Date), except if Kirkhill has not paid any and all amounts due under the Consent Judgment or as against which an Enforcement Motion has been filed and served, both as of the Termination Date. In such a case, the Consent Judgment will expire upon the date all payments have been made and/or all proceedings under the

1	Enforcement Motion have been concluded.
2	
3	IT IS SO STIPULATED.
4	FOR THE REGIONAL BOARD:
5	·
6	Dated: 10/28/11
7	
8	xxv. Bltl_
9	Kurt V. Berchtold
10	Executive Officer
11	
12	
13	FOR KIRKHILL-TA, Co.
14	Dated:, 2011
15	
16	(Print)
17	Its
18	APPROVED AS TO FORM.
19	Date: October, 2011
20	Date: 044901
21	By: / Cure Gary Tavetian
22	Attorneys for Plaintiff People of the State of California,
23	ex rel. Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region
24	,
25	Date: October, 2011
26	By: Donald J. Kula
27	Perkins Coie LLP Attorney for Kirkhill-TA-Co.
28	8
	Consent Agreement and Stipulation for Entry of Final Judgment

P 1	Enforcement Motion have been concluded.
2	
3	IT IS SO STIPULATED.
4	FOR THE REGIONAL BOARD:
5	
6	
7	Dated:
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	FOR KIRKHILL-TA, Co.
14	Dated: <u>Der. 2B</u> , 2011
15	Vy Fast /2
16	VM SCIST COALSFORD (Print)
17	Its VP FINANCE
18	APPROVED AS TO FORM.
19	Date: October, 2011
20	Date. October
21	By: Gary Tavetian
22	Attorneys for Plaintiff People of the State of California,
23	ex rel. Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region
24	
25	Date: October 24 2011
26	By: Donald J. Kula
27	Perkins Coie LLP Attorney for Kirkhill-TA-Co.
28	. 8
	Consent Agreement and Stipulation for Entry of Final Judgment

JUDGE FRANCISCO F. FIRMAT